



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/845,057	04/27/2001	Kathleen Riddell Polizzi	68110328.715	1459
23562	7590	06/16/2005	EXAMINER	
BAKER & MCKENZIE PATENT DEPARTMENT 2001 ROSS AVENUE SUITE 2300 DALLAS, TX 75201			TANG, KENNETH	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2195	
DATE MAILED: 06/16/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/845,057	POLIZZI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Kenneth Tang	2195	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 March 2005.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-4 and 17-43 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-4 and 17-43 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 27 August 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2/7/05.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the Amendment filed on 3/21/05. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but were not found to be persuasive.
2. Claims 1-4 and 17-43 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 17 and 22-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention:
 - a. In claims 17, 22, 34 and 43, "SQR" is indefinite and the acronym needs to be spelled out.
 - b. In claim 23, "a user" (line 5) is indefinite because it is not made explicitly clear whether or not this refers to the at least one user defined in the preamble or if another user is being introduced.
 - c. In claim 26, "a user" (line 5) is indefinite because it is not made explicitly clear whether or not this refers to the at least one user defined in the preamble or if another user is being introduced.
 - d. In claim 36, "a service broker" (lines 1-2) is indefinite because there is no relationship or connection made with anything else in the claim. This limitation is in the claim but does absolutely nothing.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-4, 18-21, 23, and 36-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ahlberg et al. (hereinafter Ahlberg) (US 6,587,836 B1) in view of Parasnus et al. (hereinafter Parasnus) (US 6,334,146 B1).

5. As to claim 1, Ahlberg teaches a computer system configured to communicate with a plurality of users through a network interface, wherein at least one of the plurality of users communicates with the network interface through a computer network, the computer system comprising:

a service broker (dispatcher) (*Fig. 6, item 206*) electrically connected to the network interface, the service broker controlling a level of access to the computer system by a user (*col. 8, lines 33-53, col. 10, line 60*);

an authentication server electrically connected to the service broker (dispatcher), the authentication server configured to determine a level of access to be granted to a user based upon data stored therein (*col. 8, lines 33-53, col. 10, line 60, lines 13, lines 66-67*);

a repository (cookie jar server) (*Fig. 2, item 28*) electrically connected to the service brokers the repository comprising a computer memory encoded with a plurality of objects

(common objects) including at least one job which may be accessed by the users (*col. 8, lines 7-58*);

an event server (dispatch server) electrically connected to the service broker (dispatcher), the event server comprising a computer memory encoded with instructions for dispatching a job for processing on the job server according to a predefined schedule (predefined time basis) (*claim 4, see Fig. 6*).

6. Ahlberg teaches producing an output report and that the output report is transmitted to the network interface for transmission to the user. However, Ahlberg fails to explicitly teach a job server electrically connected to the service broker to execute a job stored within the repository. However, Parasnus teaches an execution agent performing a series of tasks using objects in a memory-slotted workspace for a network node, wherein the execution agent interacts with the framework and/or event manager (service broker) (*col. 20, lines 48-58*). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the feature of a job server electrically connected to the service broker to execute a job stored within the repository to the existing network communication system of Ahlberg because this would help manage operations and to more efficiently manage complex manufacturing operations (*col. 1, lines 40-47, col. 19, lines 30-32, col. 20, lines 57-63*).

7. As to claim 2, Ahlberg teaches wherein the computer memory of the repository is further encoded with job properties corresponding to said at least one job, wherein said job properties define a set of input data be provided to a corresponding job server when the job is executed; and

wherein the job server is configured to process the set of input data with the job when the job is executed (*Fig. 11, col. 23, lines 49-61*).

8. As to claim 3, Ahlberg teaches wherein the computer memory of the repository is further encoded with job properties corresponding to said at least one job, wherein said job properties define a list of users to be notified when the job is executed; and wherein the job server is configured to process said job properties and provide notification to the list of users when the job is executed (*col. 3, lines 39-46*).

9. As to claim 4, Ahlberg teaches wherein the computer memory of the repository is further encoded with job properties corresponding to said at least one job, wherein said job properties define an exception condition and a list of users subscribing to the exception condition, and wherein the job server is configured to compare said exception condition to the output report to determine the existence of an exception, and to provide notification to the list of users subscribing to the exception condition if the exception condition exists when the job is executed (*col. 3, lines 39-46, col. 13, lines 15-18*).

10. As to claim 18, it is rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejection of claim 1. In addition, Ahlberg teaches wherein the job server is connected to at least one back-end database, and wherein the job server is configured to execute a job that retrieves and processes data from the back-end database, further comprising the steps of: retrieving a set of data from a back-end database corresponding to the requested job; and processing in the job server the requested job

with the set of data retrieved from the back-end database and the set of input data received from the user so as to produce an output report (*col. 6, lines 8-11*).

11. As to claims 19-21, they are rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejections of claims 2-4.

12. As to claim 23, it is rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejection of claim 1. In addition, Ahlberg teaches wherein the computer memory of the repository is further encoded with job properties corresponding to said at least one job, wherein said job properties define an exception condition and a list of users subscribing to the exception condition, and wherein the job server is configured to compare said exception condition to the output report to determine the existence of an exception, and to provide notification to the list of users subscribing to the exception condition if the exception condition exists when the job is executed (*col. 3, lines 39-46, col. 13, lines 15-18*).

13. As to claim 36, it is rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejection of claim 1. In addition, Ahlberg teaches receiving a request to execute a job from a user connected to the computer system through a computer network; retrieving the requested job and a corresponding set of input data from the repository; dispatching the requested job and the corresponding set of input data for processing on a corresponding job server; processing the requested job with the corresponding set of input data in the job server so as to produce an output report (reporting

functions and presentation); and transmitting the output report to the user through the network interface (*col. 6, lines 12-50*).

14. As to claim 37, it is rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejection of claim 3.

15. As to claim 38, Ahlberg teaches wherein said at least one set of job properties further includes an exception condition and a list of users subscribing to the exception condition, the method further comprising: comparing the output report to a corresponding exception condition to determine the existence of an exception event; providing a notification to each user in the corresponding list of users when the exception event occurs (*col. 7, lines 25-34*).

16. As to claim 39, it is rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejection of claims 34 and 35.

17. As to claim 40, Ahlberg teaches wherein the job server is connected to at least one back-end database, the method further comprising: retrieving a set of data corresponding to the requested job from a back-end database; and processing the requested job in the job server with the set of data retrieved from the back-end database and the corresponding set of input data so as to produce an output report (*col. 6, lines 12-50*).

18. As to claim 41, it is rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejection of claim 3.

19. As to claim 42, it is rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejection of claim 38.

20. **Claims 17, 22, and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ahlberg et al. (hereinafter Ahlberg) (US 6,587,836 B1) in view of Parasnus et al. (hereinafter Parasnus) (US 6,334,146 B1), and further in view of Bowman-Amuah (US 2003/0058277 A1).**

21. As to claim 17, Ahlberg and Parasnus fails to explicitly teach using an SQR job. However, Bowman-Amuah teaches using a reporting tool such as the SQR that can be viewed on an HTML page over an internet network communication (*[2045]*). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the feature of using a reporting tool such as the SQR that can be viewed on an HTML page to the existing network communication system because it is a robust report generator and it also provides a higher-level programming language (*[2045]*).

22. As to claim 22, it is rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejection of claim 17.

23. As to claim 43, it is rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejection of claim 17.

24. **Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ahlberg et al. (hereinafter Ahlberg) (US 6,587,836 B1) in view of Parasnus et al. (hereinafter Parasnus) (US 6,334,146 B1), and further in view of Wolff (US 6,247,047 B1).**

25. As to claim 24, it is rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejection of claim 1. However, Ahlberg in view of Parasnus fails to explicitly teach defining an input form to a user. Wolff teaches generating an input form that is communicated to a user over a network (*see Abstract*). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the feature of defining an input form to a user to the existing input receiving network communication system of Ahlberg in view of Parasnus in order to obtain the benefit of having an organized means to display the input in a form that can be presented on the display of a user node (*see Abstract*).

26. **Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ahlberg et al. (hereinafter Ahlberg) (US 6,587,836 B1) in view of Parasnus et al. (hereinafter Parasnus) (US 6,334,146 B1), in view of Wolff (US 6,247,047 B1), and further in view of Bowman-Amuah (US 2003/0058277 A1).**

27. As to claim 25, Ahlberg and Parasnus fails to explicitly teach using an SQR job. However, Bowman-Amuah teaches using a reporting tool such as the SQR that can be viewed on an HTML page over an internet network communication ([2045]). It would have been obvious

to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the feature of using a reporting tool such as the SQR that can be viewed on an HTML page to the existing network communication system because it is a robust report generator and it also provides a higher-level programming language (*[2045]*).

28. **Claims 26-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ahlberg et al. (hereinafter Ahlberg) (US 6,587,836 B1) in view of Parasnus et al. (hereinafter Parasnus) (US 6,334,146 B1), and further in view of Bienvenu et al. (hereinafter Bienvenu) (US 6,526,438 B1).**

29. As to claim 26, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated in the rejection of claim 1. In addition, Ahlberg teaches wherein the computer memory of the repository is further encoded with job properties corresponding to said at least one job, wherein said job properties define a list of users to be notified when the job is executed; and wherein the job server is configured to process said job properties and provide notification to the list of users when the job is executed (*col. 3, lines 39-46*). Furthermore, Ahlberg teaches wherein the computer memory of the repository is further encoded with job properties corresponding to said at least one job, wherein said job properties define an exception condition and a list of users subscribing to the exception condition, and wherein the job server is configured to compare said exception condition to the output report to determine the existence of an exception, and to provide notification to the list of users subscribing to the exception condition if the exception condition exists when the job is executed (*col. 3, lines 39-46, col. 13, lines 15-18*). Ahlberg and Parasnus fails to explicitly teach

having a portal page corresponding to at least one user, which dynamically updates the objects to an output report. However, Bienvenu teaches network subscriber communication which supports a dynamic portal (*see Abstract, col. 1, lines 52-63, etc.*). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the feature of a internet portal in a subscription/network system to the existing web based network system because it would increase the convenience for the user (*col. 1, lines 52-63*).

30. As to claims 27-28, they are rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejections of claims 2-3.

31. As to claim 29, Bienvenu teaches wherein the notification is provided through e-mail (*col. 7, lines 62-67*). Ahlberg also teaches notifications through email on Figs 4 and 10.

32. As to claim 30, Bienvenu teaches wherein the notification is provided by updating a dynamically updated portal object in a user's portal page (*see Abstract, col. 1, lines 52-63, etc.*).

33. As to claim 31, it is rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejection of claim 4.

34. As to claim 32, it is rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejection of claim 29.

35. As to claim 33, it is rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejection of claims 26 and 30.

36. **Claims 34-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ahlberg et al. (hereinafter Ahlberg) (US 6,587,836 B1) in view of Parasnus et al. (hereinafter Parasnus) (US 6,334,146 B1), in view of Bienvenu et al. (hereinafter Bienvenu) (US 6,526,438 B1) and further in view of Bowman-Amuah (US 2003/0058277 A1).**

37. As to claims 34-35, they are rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejection of claim 17.

Response to Arguments

38. During patent examination, the pending claims must be “given their broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification.” *In re Hyatt*, 211 F.3d 1367, 1372, 54 USPQ2d 1664, 1667 (Fed. Cir. 2000). Applicant always has the opportunity to amend the claims during prosecution, and broad interpretation by the examiner reduces the possibility that the claim, once issued, will be interpreted more broadly than is justified. *In re Prater*, 415 F.2d 1393, 1404-05, 162 USPQ 541, 550-51 (CCPA 1969).

39. *Applicant argues on pages 13 and 14 of the Remarks that Ahlberg does not teach the repository nor the event server.*

In response, the Examiner respectfully disagrees. The broadest reasonable interpretation of a repository is merely any central place where data is stored and maintained. In Ahlberg, this could be the cookie jar server 28 or any of the many other servers shown in Fig. 2. Likewise, the

broadest reasonable interpretation of an event server is merely any server that contains events and the dispatcher server (as well as any of the many other servers in Fig. 2) satisfy the broadest reasonable interpretation.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kenneth Tang whose telephone number is (571) 272-3772. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30AM - 6:00PM, Every other Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng-Ai An can be reached on (571) 272-3756. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Kt
6/12/05



MENG-AL T. AN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2195